

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 CAROL GESCHKE,) CASE NO. C08-0323-MAT
9 Plaintiff,)
10 v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
11 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
of Social Security, and SOCIAL SECURITY)
12 ADMINISTRATION,)
13 Defendants.)
_____)

15 The Court recently issued an Order Granting Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order
16 Limiting Review to the Administrative Record. (Dkt. 25.) Plaintiff now seeks reconsideration of
17 that Order. (Dkt. 27.) For the reasons described below, the Court finds no basis for granting
18 plaintiff's request.

19 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule (7)(h)(1): “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The
20 court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior
21 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its
22 attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Plaintiff fails to identify any manifest error in the

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
PAGE -1

01 Court's ruling. Nor does any of the "new evidence" identified by plaintiff (*see* Dkt. 27) provide
02 a basis for reconsidering that ruling. Instead, if anything, plaintiff raises issues properly addressed
03 in the final resolution of this matter.

04 In sum, the Court finds no basis for reconsidering its Order granting defendants' request
05 for a protective order. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 27) is DENIED.

06 DATED this 28th day of May, 2008.

07 
08 Mary Alice Theiler
09 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22